

REMARKS

The claims have been amended after final rejection to present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, in that claims 1, 14, and 19 fail to recite sufficient structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define how a student seated at the work station can "freely position his or her legs under the storage surface" so that an integral structural able to function as claimed is recited. The Examiner further stated that claims 1-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 14, and 19 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define how the student seated at the work station can freely position his or her legs under the storage surface so that an integral structure able to function as claimed is recited.

Claim 1 has been amended to claim specifically that the means for supporting supports the work surface at a height above the floor accessible for work to a student seated at a chair at the work station, and that the storage surface is supported at a sufficient distance from the floor to allow the student seated on a chair at the work station to freely position at least a distal portion of his or her legs under the storage surface. The term "at least a distal portion" has been added, since perhaps not "all" of the students' legs will be positioned under the storage surface. While claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the work surface is a sufficient height from the floor so that the legs of

the student, or at least a distal portion of the legs of the student, can be positioned freely under the storage surface, the requirement in the body of the claim that the storage surface be of sufficient distance from the floor to allow the student seated on a chair at the work station to freely position their legs under the storage surface provides the structural element and interconnection of the structural element to positively position and define how the student at the work station can freely position their legs under the storage surface.

Claim 14 now recites the structural elements and interconnection of the structural elements to allow the student work station to function as claimed to make clear that at least three support legs are an element of the invention claimed in claim 14. The "at least three support legs" elements recited on line 3 was formerly set forth on line 16. Claim 14 has been amended specifically to claim that the at least three support legs support the work surface at a height above the floor that is accessible for work to a student seated at a chair at the work station, and that the storage surface is supported at a sufficient distance from the floor to allow the student seated on a chair at the work station to freely position at least a distal portion of his or her legs under the storage surface. These amendments particularly point out and distinctly claim the structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define how the student seated at the work station can freely position his or her legs under the storage surface so that an integral structure able to function as claimed is recited.

Claim 19 has been amended to distinctly claim the structural elements and the interconnection of the elements to positively position and define how a student seated at a work station can "freely position his or her legs under the storage surface." Claim 19 now specifically claims that the radius of curvature of the interior peripheral edge of the work station defines a work

surface interior dimension that is larger than a maximum horizontal transverse dimension of a wheel chair on which a student at a work station may be seated. This recitation of the central opening of the work surface allows the wheelchair in which the student is seated to be freely rotatable in the central opening independent of obstruction of the arms of the wheelchair by the storage surface. Since claim 19 relates generally to the embodiment shown in Figs. 5 and 6 of the drawing where the central opening of the storage surface is larger than the maximum horizontal transverse dimension of a wheelchair with arms so that a wheelchair can freely rotate independent of the obstruction of the arms of the storage surface. With the wheelchair freely rotatable, at least a distal portion of the legs of a student seated in the wheelchair will be disposed under the storage surface.

Additionally, amended claim 19 particularly points out and distinctly claims that the entryway is sufficiently large to allow for ingress and egress of a wheel chair. And the at least three support legs are claimed now to support the work surface, the storage surface, and the safety means above the floor with the work surface supported at a height above the floor that is accessible to a student seated on a wheelchair at the work station and the storage surface supported at a sufficient distance from the floor to allow the student seated on the wheelchair at the student work station to freely position a distal portion of his or her legs under the storage surface. The amended claim 19 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. The amendments are supported throughout the specification and the drawing.

Claims 1, 14, and 19 clearly provide sufficient structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define how the student seated at the work station can freely position a distal portion of his or her legs under the storage surface.

Claims 2-13 are dependent on amended claim 1.

Claims 15-18 are dependent on amended claim 14.

Claim 20 is dependent on amended claim 19.

Claims 2-13, 15-18, and 20 are preferred embodiments of the amended base claims and entitled to allowance on the same bases.

As the Examiner has stated that claims 1-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the applicant respectfully requests that claims 1-20 be allowed in light of the amendments made and as requested by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, applicant believes that all the claims presented in this application are allowable over the prior art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the amended claims be admitted in that they present rejected claims in better condition for allowance or for consideration on appeal, that the Examiner reconsider his rejection of same, or that the Examiner's action be made final with respect to same.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. McKenna
Registered Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 32,368

MICHAEL R. MCKENNA
500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(312) 321-0123

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 26, 2004.

Date: 5/26/04 Signed: Ruth Z. Leib.